

A

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS: 28 30

NEGATIVE

POINTS: 29

School: Young Genesis

School: Palo Alto

Speaker: Lakshmi Balan

Speaker: Max Leibel Leial

The better debating was done by the ADD ~~POS~~ from Lakshmi Balan
POS OF NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: ~~POS~~

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Political conditions humanitarian aid
save lives etc.

Value: Justice

#1 Moral Imperative
Cutting off aid

Half a million would die

#2 { #12 Not humanitarian if there are conditions
#13 Contradiction to duties
#14 Down evaluate

#3 Freekettle
Unjust

PARLI

Long run
no net impact

Justice

Deontology vs Utilitarianism

Does LD have trickery?

A

Young Ladies LB vs Palo Alto NL
1
Banner LOS

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS: ~~27~~ 23.

School: Young Ladies LB
Speaker: Lakshmi Balram

NEGATIVE

POINTS: 27

School: Palo Alto NL
Speaker: Max Lenat

The better debating was done by the Neg from Palo Alto NL.
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

HTT HTT

Signed: _____

(Lakshmi Balram)

HTT HTT

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff

V=Justice

VC= deontology.

- Learn to pause, placing emphasis on certain words has a larger impact than stated lots of words

Neg

V=Justice

VC= protecting general welfare

- Look up more evidence, a lot of your points were dropped due to lack of evidence. Good job on the cross fire

Cont = At First unclear (speaker contradicted herself)
↳ moral and legal obligation
* Failed to state legal obligation in cross ex.
↳ Somalia evidence backfired Dropped

Cont = ~~Conditionality~~ Can (Evidence and examples)
↳ Improve Growth.
↳ Human Rights should be placed over economic growth. Win

Cont = Conditionality is unethical
↳ or unjust
↳ opponent provided Impities.
* Update your Evidence. Win

Cont = policy conditions alleviates poverty.
↳ Failed to provide Impities.
↳ you Agreed, you agreed with this point rather than refuting it. Win
Not addressed.

Cont = Conditionality is ineffective (provided evidence)
↳ Conceded this in cross examining failed to effectively answer analogy on Chockings. Refuted
↳ Refuted with more recent evidence.

Cont = Conditionality helps conditions in the long run.
↳ upheld cont. through evidence.
↳ Refuted deontology
↳ Opponent's Refutes failed. Win

A

1

Young Genius LB vs Palo Alto NL
O'Connor WS

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS: 30

NEGATIVE

POINTS: 30

School: Young Genius

School: Palo Alto

Speaker: LB

Speaker: NE NL

The better debating was done by the Neg from Palo Alto
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Neil Kulkarni

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff (notes on back)
 justice O = win X = loss
 decn. → about human rights → people not - cannot focus means to an individual end events & instead of majority, each person
 → def. supports Neg
 HA moral obligation → moral v. legal → Neg agrees → more effort on aid
 P.C. delays aid - no legal → no evidence of immediate w/ conditions → Aff did not follow through
 samaria → prevents wrong situations. → Neg. evidence provided
 P.C. unethical → people hostage to political goals → makes sure aid goes
 P.C. ineffective → Bosnia to right Kenya, Malia Mosah-Bank(?) locations
 Belgium, US, FC on route - no Aff response yet
 → ~~that~~ improves rights through economy and general welfare

Neg (notes on back)
 V: justice O = win X = loss
 VC: promoting general welfare conditions delays aid → people > societal welfare
 CF: economic growth → human rights abuse → concealed economic growth
 - helps people political goals - reduces poverty → aid improves economy → leads to rights
 X: alleviates poverty/suffering → Afghanistan → more aid endorsement
~~no specific~~ → Aff evidence to reduce poverty
 no specific examples → good pushing through
 C3: conditionality → bad terms → N. Korea lead to failed - stopped → denied conditions future policies nuclear program

Neg wins because he supported his case, aff left things off so they were dropped.
 Check back and flaw for details

B

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS: 25

School: Westmont

Speaker: Madhav ~~Red~~ Nethav

NEGATIVE

POINTS: 24

School: Young Genius

Speaker: Brandon Ma

The better debating was done by the MA from Westmont
AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended:

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Oral REE

B

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS: 26

NEGATIVE

POINTS: 28

School: Westmont

School: Young Genius

Speaker: MN

Speaker: BrMa

The better debating was done by the Neg from Young Genius
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Neil Kulkarni

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff (general notes on back)

1) justice O = win X = loss
2) protecting human rights

conditions → P.C. always exist
state H.R. → H.A. has no political impacts
→ corrupt gov't can take it away
→ giving does not mean receiving (evidence)

P.C. ineffective → corruption
uganda, Sierra-Leone aid to wrong people

unnecessary withholding
→ all evidence based on NGOs
→ recipient v. donor issue
"foreign countries" → geographical location
- gov't affiliation "is by location"

P.C. force dependence
(?) no response from Neg
- Aff needs to call out

delay aid those who need it
malicia → Neg evidence presented

P.C. works → always exist → P.C. work (?) → that is Aff's burden

Neg (general notes on back)

(V) justice O = win X = loss
(VC) defending human rights

(C1) i.c. necessary
- no evidence for ineffectiveness
→ that is Aff's burden

(C2) bring peace
→ development → alleviates suffering, promotes rights
→ relation does not mean automatic usage

~~X~~ = P.C. combat → N. Korea
corruption - only support donor gov't
conditions ineffective, weapons exist
→ (?) → evidence stands

Neg wins based on pushing through on every point. Check back and flow for more individual details.

B

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS: 24

NEGATIVE

POINTS: 25

School: Westmont MN

School: Young Genius Br

Speaker: Madhav Nehkar

Speaker: Brandon Ma.

The better debating was done by the Aff from Westmont MN.
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: X

Signed: [Signature] (Sabitya Atlari)

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF V = Justice VC = Protecting Human Rights.

neg V = Justice VC = Defending Human Rights.

Cont: Conditionality undermines Aid.
↳ Imprecisely provided.
↳ Sumatran food crisis
The Imprecisely provided were not sufficient.
Win

Cont: ~~Aid~~ ~~was~~ ~~not~~ Conditionality is ineffective
*** Speak Slower ***
- The evidence provided was not supported and Refuted. **Refute**

Cont: political Conditionality is Ineffective
↳ Rejection of Aid
↳ Conceded to your opponents claims against it.
↳ unneeded withholding **Drop**
↳ Foster dependence **Drop**

Cont: Helps brings about peace
Drop
Value - Value criterion debate was clearly won by the Affirmative.

Cont: deny aid to those who need it
Drop

Cont: Combats Corruption.
↳ Very Supportive Evidence. **Win**

Cont: unconditionally works. (Imprecisely provided)
Win

used the example of peace conditionality, peace conditionality is not the same as political conditionality. **Research**

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE POINTS: _____

School: Westmont MN

Speaker: _____

NEGATIVE POINTS: _____

School: Palo Alto NC

Speaker: _____

The better debating was done by the NEG from Palo Alto NC
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both affirmative and negative sides posed strong & structured arguments on the topic with similar value & criteria. The essential point the affirmative provided was the definition of the humanitarian efforts is to provide short term relief, ~~and~~ ^{one of} the distinction ~~of~~ between developmental aid & humanitarian aid also helped. The ~~aff~~ negative countered short-term can be relative & up to one year, and that developmental aid is part of humanitarian aid. The affirmative side fell a bit short in this ~~po~~ critical point by not attacking directly the statements above.

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS: 29

School: Westmont MN

Speaker: _____

NEGATIVE

POINTS: 28

School: Palo Alto ~~CA~~ NC

Speaker: _____

The better debating was done by the AFF from Westmont
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Sufjan.

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF: Countering opponent points contention by distinguishy humanitarian development aid. during cross-r you did establish aid to Bosnia and Mosumbiane may not be humanitarian. Also with given aid the conditions have not improved in Mos.

Opp: You did debate well with good example. they were - just not too strong and clear ~~cut~~ in your favor. Agreed that conditional aid could yeild better results but that's just one contention in your favor. Humanitarian aid as defined in resolution and agreed during debate is short term for disasters.

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS: _____

NEGATIVE

POINTS: _____

School: Westmont MN

School: Palo Alto NC

Speaker: _____

Speaker: _____

The better debating was done by the aff from Westmont
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Hati was untouched - short term can work
- much of aff evidence assumes longer - does not ~~address~~
address short term / long term difference